REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 have been replaced by new claims 7-11 which obviate the indefiniteness noted in the Official action.

New claim 7 recites an electrically assisted bicycle in which one of the front and rear wheels is driven by a motor and thus constitutes an auxiliary driven wheel. A human-power brake mechanism is operably connected to a driver-operated brake lever for braking the non-auxiliary driven wheel. The motor is controlled by a motor control circuit which is operably connected to the brake lever, wherein:

> the auxiliary driven wheel is regeneratively braked by the motor, and the non-auxiliary driven wheel is not braked by the human power brake mechanism when a displacement amount of the brake lever is less than or equal to a predetermined amount, and
> the auxiliary driven wheel is regeneratively braked by the motor, and the non-auxiliary driven wheel is braked by the human power brake mechanism when the displacement amount of the brake lever is greater than the predetermined amount (see the paragraph bridging pages 12 and 13 of the specification).

The original claims were rejected over Pennebaker et al. U.S. Patent 4,221,275 taken alone or in combination with other references.

Pennebaker et al. discloses a bicycle 2 that includes a motor for driving a front wheel (auxiliary driven wheel) 18, and a brake lever 20 which can be depressed to brake a rear wheel (non-auxiliary driven wheel) 12 by means of two engaging tips 140, 142. The motor is also used as a generator to convert kinetic energy of the bicycle 2 to electrical energy for charging a motor-driving battery 16 when the brake

lever 20 is depressed. However, Pennebaker et al. does not disclose a mechanism which provides for the selective braking recited in claim 7. That is, there is no disclosure of a mechanism wherein the auxiliary driven wheel 18 is regeneratively braked by the motor, and the non-auxiliary driven wheel 12 is not braked by the human power brake mechanism when a displacement amount of the brake lever is less than or equal to a predetermined amount as presently claimed in claim 7.

Furthermore, that feature is not made obvious by any of the other of the cited prior art references.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 7 distinguishes patentably over the cited prior art, and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: September 15, 2004

By: _____
Alan E. Kopecki
Registration No. 25,813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620